

☐ SECRET☒ CONFIDENTIAL 02157☐ UNCLASSIFIED

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

CONTRACT NO.

TASK NO.

TO:

DATE

20 February 1968

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

7

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

1 April 1968 (Phase I)

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

Declass Review by NGA.

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE

☐ YES☒ NO

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED - 95% (Phase I)

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED - Fixed Price

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)

INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT
IF YES, CHECK TYPE☐ YES☒ NO☐ COST ☐ AWARD FEE ☐ PERFORMANCE ☐ DELIVERYNOTE:
USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.
FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING4. ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY2. ☐ EXCELLENT5. ☐ AVERAGE3. ☐ VERY GOOD6. ☒ MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

☒ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING
SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE☐ CLOSE OUT☐ OTHER (Specify)

IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

| ITEM | REC'D | DOES NOT APPLY | ITEM | REC'D | DOES NOT APPLY |
|--------------------------------------|-------|----------------|---------------------------|-------|----------------|
| PROTOTYPES | | | MANUALS | | |
| DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS | | | FINAL REPORT | | |
| PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS | | | SPECIAL TOOLING | | |
| | | | OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY | | |

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR

9 February 1968

SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR

DIVISION

☐ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP78B04770A001900010022-8

NARRATIVE REPORT

☒ INTERIM☐ FINAL

25X

1. On Thursday, 8 Feb 1968, [] and the undersigned visited [] to review the optical design of the subject contract. After an extensive review of the details of both the optical design itself and the methods and techniques for evaluating its performance, [] stated in no uncertain terms that he knew of no one in the country that could do a better or more complete job. He stated that all of the techniques being used were the most advanced and were at the edge of the state-of-the-art.

2. After reviewing the NOD 100 [] stated that he believed that the present design will give the performance characteristics indicated in the Status Report dated 10 January 1968. He made the following qualifications:

a. The optical design is certainly not complete without a completed condenser design.

b. He is not sure that the MTF analysis is valid when the MTF curve reaches a minimum above 5% MTF and then rises again before it crosses the 5% cut-off limit. He is sure (as indicated by the actual performance of the NOD 100 under similar circumstances) that the viewer will resolve a sine wave target at the spatial frequencies between the minimum and the cut-off frequencies; but, he is not sure how this will effect a complex target such as an aerial image. In other words, he cannot assign a confidence factor to the ability of the MTF analysis to predict image interpretability.

3. It was learned that the MTF of the screen was not considered in the optical performance predictions. This appears to not be of significant concern because it was likewise not considered in the NOD 100 prediction and the measured optical performance of that instrument was higher than that predicted. Notwithstanding these factors, the undersigned will attempt to furnish to [] the MTF analysis of existing screens developed []

4. After reviewing the new optical performance data that consisted of an evaluation of the NOD 110 system under white light conditions--data that was not included in the Status Report of 10 January--a meeting was held on Friday, 9 Feb 1968, at the [] facility. In attendance were []

[] and the technical monitor from NPIC. The previous day's discussion was reviewed then the philosophy of the viewer was discussed. The opinion was expressed that the viewer was being developed for a future system producing 9 1/2 inch wide imagery; therefore, the performance must be extremely high at the scanning magnification of approximately 3X, because there is no higher probability of a target appearing on-axis than at the edge of the film. The white light data indicates that the low zoom range of 3X to 30X has about the same edge performance characteristics as that of the NOD 100 and this is certainly not acceptable. It was pointed out that even though 9 1/2 inch material will probably be the largest input, the system must accommodate all widths between that and the 70mm size.

5. With the basic unacceptability of the present optical design, [] will investigate the Company position regarding further attempts to increase the performance. [] admitted that their Status Report dated 10 Jan 1968 did not constitute the Phase I report that would satisfy the contractual requirement. The report was submitted only to see if the optical design would be acceptable "as is." As stated above, [] was told it was not acceptable. Approaches, such as changing the zoom ranges to 3X to 18X and 12X to 70X will be investigated. [] agreed to have a decision by Friday, 16 February 1968.

☐ UNCLASSIFIED For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP78B04770A001900010022-8☐ SECRET

6. In a meeting at NPIC on 16 February 1968, between [redacted] and the technical monitor, it was learned that [redacted] was still in the process of investigating and determining their position and an answer was promised by 28 February 1968.

25X

25X